



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,088	01/30/2002	Amarender Kethireddy	SLA 1164	2450

7590 10/14/2004

David C. Ripma, Patent Counsel
Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc.
5750 NW Pacific Rim Boulevard
Camas, WA 98607

EXAMINER

MISTRY, O NEAL RAJAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,088

Applicant(s)

KETHIREDDY, AMARENDER

Examiner

O'Neal R Mistry

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined.

Claims 1-34 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 15, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant states that "'supplying syntax help' is not the same as automatically inserting operators between search terms.", the examiner respectfully disagrees since Goiffon does aid the user in inserting operators. In Figure 4 item 400, the user enters a search term into the text fields, in which afterwards the user initiates, Figure 4 item 414, the "GO" button. The search automatically implementing an operator and gives the user 2 additional related terms with the original search term (Figure 5 item 502). The addition terms may be edited depending on the user discretion (Figure 5 items 506, 508, 514, 518). Therefore, the examiner maintains the rejections on claim 1 based up Goiffon.

The Applicant further argues, "Goiffon and Shanahan inventions are conceptually so different that there is no motivation to combine. Because of the lack of logical correlations". However, both inventions, by Goiffon and Shanahan, are related to developing unique search queries to aid the user in retrieve of some form of data, which reads upon the title of the Applicant's application. The logic to combine is, Goiffon aids the user in developing an exclusive query to search a storage unit, and Shanahan is related for utilizing different methods, in forms of question, algorithm, and personalities, for retrieval data files in a storage unit. Shanahan has different methods for creating a

query by employing the algorithm with different questions and user's personality to compute a suggested query, so in that form that is a suggested process for supplying syntax help. Therefore, the examiner maintains the rejections for 2-34, on the grounds of Shanahan and Goiffon.

The Applicant disputes "Goiffon describes both human and automatic processes to add operators between search terms, but he never describes a syntax help popup window help that automatically appears in response to a search request." The examiner respectfully disagrees because Goiffon discloses "Fig. 6 shows them in bold print. Alternatively, they could be listed in a different color, or even in different Windows." (col. 16 lines 37-38). The examiner interprets that the syntax help provided in Goiffon was illustrated in bold print only, but there are other methods of displaying the syntax help by having different colors, or even different windows, which is also can be interprets as syntax help popup window.

Drawings

The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on **01/30/2002** are acceptable for the examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by

Art Unit: 2173

another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected, Goiffin discloses a method for providing search inquiry syntax help, the method comprising;

Formulating a search engine search request (col. 3 lines 20-23).

In response to the search request, automatically supplying search syntax help including the display of search syntax characters supported by the search engine (col. 5 lines 37-40, Figures 4 & 5). The examiner interprets in that in Figure 5, after the user has entered the a search character strings, apparatus in Goiffin's patent displays multiple search syntax characters suggested by the search engine.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanahan et al (U.S. Patent Number: 6,732,090), referred to as Shanahan, in view of Goiffon et al (U.S. Patent Number: 6,453,312), referred to as Goiffon.

Shanahan shows a system that includes a user-interface that demonstrates a set of documents service requests that identify themes. The system has the capability for structuring a search engine search request, obtain search request and supply a improved search request (col. 30 lines 33-50), search a database, display results of search request to user (col. 8 lines 25-40 & Fig. 2), and customization for user level experience (col. 33 lines 13-37). Shanahan fails to disclose the ability in systematically aiding the user to build a more enhanced search request, and displaying the interface for the building an enhanced query.

Goiffon shows query development by traversing through the various relationships of words that are stated the query. The user has the ability to expand the query to make it broad or has the capability to restrict query to make it narrow (col. 15 lines 43-47). The process is done manually or automated, which is preferenced by the user, to develop the enhanced query (col. 5 lines 37-41). Goiffon discloses steps in which the query can be expanded or limited, and has the ability to display other topics that are affiliated with subject of search request (Figures 5-7 & col. 5 – col. 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate an advance systematic step used to develop a query, by Goiffon, into a system that has the ability to restructure queries and use the queries to search a database, by Shanahan.

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to

search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 2 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan discloses a method comprising:

Presenting a search engine user interface with a selectable user interface edit box for formulating a search request (col. 25 lines 8- 20).

Wherein formulating a search engine search request includes selecting the edit box (Fig. 19); and

Shanahan fails to state "wherein automatically supplying search syntax helps includes displaying a popup window with search syntax help in response to the search request formulated in the edit box".

Goiffon discloses wherein automatically supplying search syntax help includes displaying a popup window with search syntax help in response to the search request formulated in the edit box. (col. 16 lines 29-46)

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 3 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan fails discloses "displaying search syntax characters supported by the search engine,

includes displaying search syntax characters selected from the group including connectors and operators.”

Goiffon discloses displaying search syntax characters supported by the search engine, includes displaying search syntax characters selected from the group including connectors and operators (col. 17 lines 31-49).

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 4 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan discloses automatically supplying search syntax help includes displaying search syntax character definitions (col. 41 lines 40- 55).

Claim 5 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan discloses automatically supplying search syntax help includes supplying a list of frequently used search syntax characters. (col. 37 line 58- col. 38 line 4 & figure 32)

Claim 6 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan fails to state, “automatically supplying search syntax helps includes displaying a list of every supported search syntax character”.

Goiffon discloses automatically supplying search syntax helps include displaying a list of every supported search syntax character. (col. 16 lines 29-65).

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 7 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan fails to state, "automatically supplying search syntax helps includes displaying a list of every supported search syntax character are used".

Goiffon discloses automatically supplying search syntax helps include displaying a list of every supported search syntax character is used. (col. 15 lines 39-63).

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 8 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan fails to state "a search engine search request includes forming a search request with at least one search term and a first search syntax character; and wherein supplying examples in which the search syntax characters are used includes supplying an example in which the plurality of search syntax characters modify search terms."

Goiffon discloses a search engine search request includes forming a search request with at least one search term and a first search syntax character (col. 15 lines 22-38); and

wherein supplying examples in which the search syntax characters are used includes supplying an example in which the plurality of search syntax characters modify search terms (col. 15 lines 38-63)

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 9 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan fails to state "formulating a search engine search request includes forming a search request with a plurality of search syntax characters; and where supplying examples in which the search syntax characters are used includes supplying an example in which the plurality of search syntax characters modify search terms".

Goiffon discloses formulating a search engine search request includes forming a search request with a plurality of search syntax characters (col. 15 lines 22-38); and

wherein supplying examples in which the search syntax characters are used includes supplying an example in which the plurality of search syntax characters modify search terms (col. 15 lines 38-63 & col. 16 lines 29- 47)

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 10 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan fails to state "formulating a search engine search request includes forming a search request with a first and second search term; and wherein supplying examples in which the search syntax characters are used includes supplying an example in which the first search term is linked to the second search term using the first search syntax characters".

Goiffon states formulating a search engine search request includes forming a search request with a first and second search term (col. 16 lines 29- 47); and

wherein supplying examples in which the search syntax characters are used includes supplying an example in which the first search term is linked to the second search term using the first search syntax characters (col. 16 line 56 – col. 17 line 5)

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 11 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan discloses submitting the search request to the search engine (col. 30 lines 32-50); and

In response to submitting the search request, automatically closing the search syntax help popup window. (col. 20 lines 20- 27), but Shanahan fails to state "following the formulating of a search engine search request"

Goiffon discloses following the formulating of a search engine search request. (col. 15 lines 22-38).

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 12 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan discloses displaying the results of the search; (col. 20lines 4-28), as well as in response to the editing the search request, automatically supplying search syntax help (col.51 lines 40-55), but fails state "editing the search engine search request"

Goiffon discloses editing the search engine search request (col. 3 lines20-23)

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 13 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan states changing the focus of the search engine user interface (figure 12); and

In response to changing the search engine user interface focus, automatically closing search syntax help popup window (col. 20 lines 45-59), but fails to disclose following the formulating of a search engine search request.

Goiffon states following the formulating of a search engine search request (col. 3 lines 20-23).

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching set forth by Shanahan and Goiffon to result the most efficiency of developing an enhanced query and using the query to search a database, which would directly produce the best findings. The combination would cause a novice user to develop a highly sophisticated search.

Claim 14 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan states providing a user selectable syntax help enablement option (col. 33 lines 7-59 & col. 72 lines 24-45 & figure 28); and

Wherein automatically supplying search syntax help includes supplying search syntax help in response enabling the syntax help option col. 33 lines 7-59 & col. 72 lines 24-45 & figure 28).

Claim 15 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan discloses providing user selectable search syntax help configuration options (col. 33 lines 7-59 & col. 72 lines 24-45 & figure 28); and

Wherein automatically supplying search syntax help includes supplying search syntax help configured in response to the search syntax help configuration options (col. 37 line 58 - col. 38 line 4 & col. 33 lines 10-67 & figure 28, 32).

Claim 16 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan discloses selectable search syntax help configuration options includes providing a popup window with frequently-used search syntax characters as a default configuration. (col. 37 line 58 - col. 38 line 4 & col. 33 lines 10-67 & figure 28, 32)

Claim 17 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan discloses selectable search syntax help configuration options includes providing a popup window with a list of every supported search syntax characters as a default configuration (col. 37 line 58 - col. 38 line 4 & col. 33 lines 10-67 & figure 28, 32)

Claim 29 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, Shanahan states at least a second selectable user interface focus (col. 20 lines 20-45); and

Wherein the search syntax help popup window closes in response the second user interface focus being selected (col. 20 lines 20-45, Figure 10 1020 or 1014).

Claim 30 being rejected in regards to Shanahan in view of Goiffon, a configuration menu with a user selectable check box to enable the syntax help popup window (col. 20 line 45 – col. 21 line 5); and,

Where the search syntax help popup window appears in response to the configuration check box being selected (col. 60 lines 1-45).

Claim 18 is substantially equivalent to claim 2, therefore claims 18 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 19 is substantially equivalent to claim 3, therefore claims 19 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 20 is substantially equivalent to claim 4, therefore claims 20 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 21 is substantially equivalent to claim 5, therefore claims 21 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 22 is substantially equivalent to claim 6, therefore claims 22 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 23 is substantially equivalent to claim 7, therefore claims 23 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 24 is substantially equivalent to claim 8, therefore claims 24 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 25 is substantially equivalent to claim 9, therefore claims 25 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 26 is substantially equivalent to claim 10, therefore claims 26 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 27 is substantially equivalent to claim 11, therefore claims 27 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 28 is substantially equivalent to claim 12, therefore claims 28 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 31 is substantially equivalent to claim 16, therefore claims 31 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 32 is substantially equivalent to claim 17, therefore claims 32 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 33 is substantially equivalent to claim 15, therefore claims 18 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claim 34 is substantially equivalent to claim 14, therefore claims 18 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to O'Neal R Mistry whose telephone number is (703) 305-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W Cabeca can be reached on (703)308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O'Neal Mistry
Assistant Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2173
o'neal.mistry@uspto.gov


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173